



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 17, 1996

Ms. Joanne Wright
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR96-1699

Dear Ms. Wright:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 101051.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for "all maintenance records on the intersection traffic light [at Perrin Beitel Road and IH 410 East access road] for the six months prior to" December 29, 1995. You seek to withhold the requested information from required public disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

When asserting section 552.103(a), a governmental body must establish that the requested information relates to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation.¹ Thus, under section 552.103(a) a governmental body's burden is two-pronged. The governmental body must establish that (1) litigation is either pending or reasonably

¹Section 552.103(a) excepts from required public disclosure information:

(1) relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature or settlement negotiations, to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party; and

(2) that the attorney general or the attorney of the political subdivision has determined should be withheld from public inspection.

anticipated and that (2) the requested information relates to that litigation. *See Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990) at 4.

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 (1986) at 4. Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 (1989) at 5 (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Nor does the mere fact that an individual hires an attorney and alleges damages serve to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983) at 2. Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 (1986) at 4.


You claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated because a claim has been filed against the department. You do not, however, represent that the claim is in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code ch. 101, or applicable municipal ordinance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996) (fact that governmental body received claim letter that it represents to this office to be in compliance with notice requirements of Texas Tort Claims Act, Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code ch. 101, or applicable municipal ordinance shows that litigation is reasonably anticipated). We note that the attorney has not threatened to sue the department. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983) at 2. We conclude that you have failed to meet the requisite showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated and, therefore, you must release the information to the requestor.³

²In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

³We note that if, in the future, you assert that section 552.103(a) is applicable on the basis of a notice of claim letter, you should affirmatively represent to this office that the letter complies with the requirements of the TTCA or applicable municipal statute or ordinance, or otherwise establish that section 552.103 applies.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Todd Reese". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Todd Reese
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RTR/rho

Ref.: ID# 101051

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Jason Khattar
Law Offices of Ed Goldner
750 East Mulberry, Suite 501
San Antonio, Texas 78212
(w/o enclosures)